UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,433	12/27/2001	David Harel	72829	1725

22242 7590 07/26/2005

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER	
NAHAR, QAMRUN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,433	HAREL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Qamrun Nahar	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 February 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 4/27/05.

2. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn in view of applicant's submission of substitute formal drawings.

3. The objection to the disclosure is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

4. The objections to claims 10, 20-21, 48 and 51 are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

5. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention to claims 15-16, 27, 33, 34 and 41 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment and remarks/arguments.

6. Claim 21 has been canceled.

7. Claims 1, 3-5, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 27, 31, 39, 41, 48 and 51 have been amended.

8. Claims 1-20 and 22-51 are pending.

9. Claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575).

10. Claims 10, 17, 22, 29 and 34 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575) in view of Werner Damm and David Harel, LSC's: BREATHING LIFE INTO MESSAGE CHARTS, (c) April 1998, (hereinafter "Werner").

11. Claims 11, 13, 23, 25 and 27 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575) in view of Ladkin et al. An Analysis of Message Sequence Charts, (c) June 1992, (hereinafter "Ladkin").

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575).

Per Claim 1 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- a method for specifying a system behavior, comprising: (i) providing a system Graphic User Interface (GUI) at least part of which representing real world Graphic User Interface of the system (Col.14:20 – 38; "scenario tool interface" is interpreted as real world Graphic User Interface of the system, where the scenarios represent the real world.);

- the system GUI includes objects (Col.14:1 – 10);

- the system GUI is associated with data structure describing at least the GUI objects (Col.14: 25 – 30, see describe system);

- the method includes performing steps that include the following steps (ii) and (iii), as many times as required (Col. 6: 33 – 35, see repeated iteration)**: (ii) playing-in a scenario utilizing at least one object of the system GUI, the scenario is representative of at least one use case; and specifying system reaction in response of the utilization of the at least one of said objects** (Col.5:1 – 27; "expected behavior" is defined);

- and (iii) automatically constructing formal system behavior specification that corresponds to the scenario (Col.6:38 – 45).

Per Claim 2:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said step (ii) further includes: operating at least one of said objects in the system GUI (Col.4: 27 – 30, see animation).

Per Claim 3 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said step further includes: a) specifying user action by operating at least one of said objects (Col.6: 27 – 30)**; b) specifying environment action by operating at least one of said objects** (Col.6: 27 – 30)**; and c) specifying system reaction by operating at least one of said objects** (Col.6: 27 – 30, see perform actual simulation).

Per Claim 4 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said objects include at least one internal object and wherein said step (ii) further includes operating at least one internal object (Col.15: 12 – 18).

Per Claim 5 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said objects include at least one internal object and wherein said step (ii) further includes operating at least one internal object (Col.15: 12 – 18).

Per Claim 6:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: defining at least one control construct and wherein said step (iii) includes constructing formal system behavior specification that corresponds to the control construct (Col.6:25 – 30, system control and defined).

Per Claim 7:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said control construct step includes creating generalization and loops selected from the group that includes dynamic loops, unbound loops and fixed loops (Col. 6: 33 – 35, see repeated iteration).

Per Claim 8:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said step (iii) includes constructing symbolic messages (Col.13:58 – 67).

Per Claim 9:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: reflecting in the system GUI the result of the played-in scenario (Col.6:51 – 56).

Per Claim 12:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said formal system behavior specification being at least one Symbolic timing diagram (Col.8: 46, see MSC, Message Sequence Diagrams, which is also known as Timed Sequence Diagrams or Event traced Diagrams Col.13: 59 - 60).

Per Claim 14 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising, performing the following step as many times as required: (iv) playing-out a scenario utilizing the system GUI and the system behavior specification and specifying in the system GUI at least part of the result of operation of said played-out scenario (Col.5:1 – 27; "expected behavior" is defined, which is interpreted as played-out scenario; and Col.14:25 – 28).

Per Claim 15 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: defining at least one condition that may or must hold regarding the system (Col.17:47 – 53,see occur)**; and wherein said step (iii) includes**

constructing formal system behavior specification that corresponds to said at least one condition (Col.14:25 – 30,see occur).

Per Claim 16:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein at least one of said conditions includes defining condition regarding one or more of the operated objects (Col.17: 47 – 53, see voice animation and annotation).

Per Claim 18:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of: reflecting in the system GUI the result of the operation of at least one of said objects (Col.6:51 – 56).

Per Claim 19 (Amended):

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claims 20 (Amended) & 26:

These are another versions of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1 and 14), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 24:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 12, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman

Per Claim 28:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of recording at least one played out scenario, constituting a run (Col.14:25 – 28).

Per Claim 30:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further including the step of: indicating if the system behavior specification or portion thereof is successful or violated (Col.15:3 – 12).

Per Claim 31 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said system behavior specification includes existential charts and universal charts, and wherein said universal charts include user action part, environment action part and system reaction part, and further including the step of providing a run that includes either or both of user and environment part and system reaction part, constituting a played scenario, and re-playing the run (Col.14:25 – 28).

Per Claim 32:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said system behavior specification includes existential charts and universal charts, and wherein said universal charts include user action part, environment action part and system reaction part, and further comprising the step of, tracing either or both of said existential and universal charts, and indicating if a chart is successful or violated (Col.13:58 – 67 and Col.15:3 – 12).

Per Claim 33:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further comprising the step of providing either or both of the user action part and environment action part of said run, replaying the run and indicating if existential charts are successful or violated (Col.13:58 – 67 and Col.15:3 – 12).

Per Claim 35:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 4, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman

Per Claim 36:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said system GUI includes an object map and further comprising the step of: reflecting in the object map the result of the playing-out (Col.14:47 – 66).

Per Claim 37:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said system GUI includes an object map and further comprising the step of: reflecting in the object map the result of the playing-in (Col.14:47 – 66).

Per Claim 38:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said system GUI includes an object map and further comprising the step of: reflecting in the object map the result of the playing-in (Col.14:47 – 66).

Per Claim 39 (Amended):

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1 and 14), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 40:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said playing-out is used to construct a prototype (Col.15:27 – 31).

Per Claim 41 (Amended):

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 40, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 42:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 40, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 43:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- **wherein said playing-out is used to construct a tutorial** (Col.16:51 – 67).

Per Claim 44:

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 43, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 45:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 43, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 46:

The Sherman patent discloses:

- wherein said playing-out is used to construct a final implementation of a system (Col.15:27 – 31).

Per Claim 47:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 46, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 48 (Amended):

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 46, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 49:

This is a computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 50:

This is a computer program product version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 20, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Sherman.

Per Claim 51 (Amended):

The Sherman patent discloses:

- further including animating interaction between GUI objects (Col.4: 27 – 30, see animation).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 10, 17, 22, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575) in view of Werner Damm and David Harel, LSC's: BREATHING LIFE INTO MESSAGE CHARTS, (c) April 1998, (hereinafter "Werner").

Per Claim 10 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sherman does not explicitly teach wherein said formal system behavior specification being at least one Live sequence chart (LSC). Werner teaches that formal system behavior specification being at least one Live sequence chart (LSC) (see Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Sherman to include that formal system behavior specification being at least one Live sequence chart (LSC) using the teaching of Werner. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to distinguish between possible and necessary behavior both globally and locally.

Per Claim 17:

The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and Sherman further teaches the step of: selectively modifying at least one of said charts (Col.4:10 – 14).

Per Claim 22 (Amended):

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above, claim 10, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also obvious.

Per Claim 29:

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Sherman further teaches wherein said system behavior specification includes existential charts and universal charts, and wherein said universal charts include user action part and system reaction part (Col.13:58 – 67).

Per Claim 34:

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and Werner further teaches wherein said Live sequence chart charts include at least two live copies of the same chart simultaneously (pg. 5, see Figure 1, "Illustrating visible events").

16. Claims 11, 13, 23, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherman (U.S. 6,205,575) in view of Ladkin et al. An Analysis of Message Sequence Charts, (c) June 1992, (hereinafter "Ladkin").

Per Claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sherman does not explicitly teach wherein said formal system behavior specification being Temporal logic language. Ladkin teaches that formal system behavior specification being Temporal logic language (page 3, 3rd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Sherman to include that formal system behavior specification being Temporal logic language using the teaching of Ladkin. The

modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide explicit safety and liveness conditions for MSC's or time sequence charts.

Per Claim 13:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sherman does not explicitly teach wherein said formal system behavior specification being at least one Timed Buchi Automata. Ladkin teaches that formal system behavior specification being at least one Timed Buchi Automata (page 3, 3rd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Sherman to include that formal system behavior specification being at least one Timed Buchi Automata using the teaching of Ladkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide MSCs in a more expressive manner.

Per Claims 23 & 25:

These are another versions of the claimed method discussed above (claims 11 and 13, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claim 27 (Amended):

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and Sherman further teaches wherein said testing includes running scenarios and forbidden scenarios (Col.14:55 – 66).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/17/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

a) The present application, in accordance with certain embodiments thereof, clears this gap by allowing the designer to define a system graphic user interface (GUI) having at least a part which represent the real-world GUI of the designed system (see element (i) of Claim 1 as amended). A non limiting example of such GUI is a calculator, which includes representation of real-world calculator's user interface, described with reference to Figs. 4 to 24 including GUI objects, such as keys, etc. (see e.g. page 7, lines 30 to 32). The user "plays in" intuitively scenarios of interest by using objects of the GUI (which resembles the real-world interface of the system of interest), and gets system feedback by specifying the system reaction in response to using the system objects (amended element (ii) of Claim 1). The usage of the objects and system reaction (such as keys in the calculator and the resulted display) is exemplified in detail in the calculator example of Figs. 4 to 24. The system then substantially automatically constructs the formal system behavior specification, (elements (iii) of amended Claim 1), exempting the user from having high level of expertise in the formal system behavior language.

The *automatic* construction ...

In contrast, Sherman in '575 discloses a system for facilitating definition, maintenance and presentation of scenarios. The system of Sherman facilitates selection of elements from system description in accordance with pre-defined syntax (Abstract, Col. 6 lines 45-50). The

system description of Sherman is defined in "low-level manner" requiring fairly extensive knowledge of the user in the system description syntax. As readily arises from Col. 3, lines 6- 28, 38-47 and Col. 7, lines 50-62, Sherman refers to the Flow diagrams. As is well known, Flow diagram is a shortcut for Data flow diagram (Bubbles representing the activities, objects and flow in a system, etc.). This is a design model that falls under the category of low level representation requiring high level of expertise from the system designer's end.

Note incidentally that to the extent that Sherman refers to "use cases" indicating higher level representation of the system (see, e.g. Col 5. lines 18-23), Sherman refers to the "use cases" in a conventional and known per se manner. Thus, Sherman refers to the known publications in Col. 5, lines 23-28 and does not suggest any "automatic" manner for translating from the use case representation into the "low level" formal system behavior specification and accordingly the "translation", if any, from the high level use case representation to the low level. The formal system behavior specification is done through manual and tedious procedure, all as discussed above.

It goes without saying that Sherman does not anticipate even remotely (amongst the other) the use of system GUI for the purpose of defining system behavior as disclosed and claimed in the present application, and obviously the teachings of Sherman do not bring about the advantages of using the system GUI ms described above.

In other words, the teachings of Sherman share common shortcomings with the prior art solutions discussed in the Background section of the specification, which, amongst the other, do not allow interaction through GUI that at least partially represent a real-world system GUI and

similar to the known prior art requires rather extensive knowledge of the formal system behavior representation (in the case of Sherman, through data flow diagrams).

In this respect Sherman teaches away from the claimed invention.

Applicants therefore respectively requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 102(e).

Claims 2-9, 1 1-16, 18, 37-38, 40, 43, 46, 49 directly or indirectly depend upon Claim 1, and should be deemed novel and non obvious over the cited prior art reference, *inter alia for the reasons* discussed with reference to Claim 1, above.

Amended Claim 19, directed to apparatus, should be deemed novel and non obvious over the cited Sherman, *inter alia* for the reasons discussed with reference to Claim 1, above.

Examiner's response:

a) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Sherman fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51. Sherman clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51.

Sherman teaches a method for specifying a system behavior, comprising: (i) providing a system Graphic User Interface (GUI) at least part of which representing real world Graphic User Interface of the system (Col.14:20 – 38; "scenario tool interface" is interpreted as real world Graphic User Interface of the system, where the scenarios represent the real world.). In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "calculator" or "keys") are not

recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, Sherman teaches (ii) playing-in a scenario utilizing at least one object of the system GUI, the scenario is representative of at least one use case; and specifying system reaction in response of the utilization of the at least one of said objects (Col.5:1 – 27; "expected behavior" is defined); ... and (iii) automatically constructing formal system behavior specification that corresponds to the scenario (Col.6:38 – 45). In addition, the court held that broadly providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace a manual activity which accomplished the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over the prior art. See In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 13 for rejection to claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

b) Reverting now to the present application ...

With respect to the dependent claim 14 that recites "play out", not only it is deemed novel and non obvious over the teachings of Sherman (for the reasons discussed above), but it is additionally distinguished from Sherman in that the latter does not disclose even remotely the play out. The examiner referred to Col. 5: lines 17-27, however, the latter merely suggests that Sherman refers to "use cases" in a conventional manner (see Col. 5, lines 23 -28, where reference is made to conventional use cases publication). The Examiner further referred to Col. 14, lines 25

to 28 of Sherman. According to the teaching of this section, scenarios can be animated. Note, incidentally, that this feature is already known from other prior art publications, e.g. there are tools that can show scenarios as ... editors). However, in contrast to the teachings of the prior art, the play out as recited in amended Claim 14, includes (amongst the other) executing the scenario(s) and reflecting in the system GUI at least part of the result of the operation of the played out scenario(s) which is well distinguished from mere animation.

...

Before turning to discuss the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 20, it is noted that amended Claim 20 includes the limitation of Claim 21. On the merits, the Examiner' substantiated the rejection of Claim 20 on the reasons elaborated with reference to Claim 1, notwithstanding the fact that Claim 1 recited *play in*, which is well distinguished from the *play out* recited in Claim 20. As discussed above (with reference to Claim 1) the teachings of Sherman do not anticipate even remotely the play-in procedure and *a fortiori* they do not anticipate even remotely the play-out procedure.

...

Claims 23-28, 30-33, 35-36, 41,42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 directly or indirectly depend upon Claim 20 (or 39) , and should be deemed novel and non obvious over the cited prior art for the reasons discussed above with reference to Claim 1.

Examiner's response:

b) Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Sherman fails to disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51.

Sherman clearly shows each and every limitation in claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51.

Sherman teaches performing the following step as many times as required: (iv) playing-out a scenario utilizing the system GUI and the system behavior specification and specifying in the system GUI at least part of the result of operation of said played-out scenario (Col.5:1 – 27; "expected behavior" is defined, which is interpreted as played-out scenario; and Col.14:25 – 28) as recited in claim 14. Furthermore, the rejection of claim 20 has been substantiated on the reasons elaborated with reference to *claims 1 and 14*, where claim 14 recites play out.

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 13 for rejection to claims 1-9, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 24, 26, 28, 30-33 and 35-51.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

c) Claims 10, 17, 22, 29 and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) ...

Since all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are based primarily on Sherman, the arguments presented above are also applicable to the 103 rejection ...

Therefore, the cited prior art references, alone and in combination, clearly teach away from the present application.

Examiner's response:

c) The Examiner has already addressed the applicant's arguments regarding Sherman in the Examiner's Response (a) and (b) above. In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 15 for

rejection to claims 10, 17, 22, 29 and 34 and paragraph 16 for rejection to claims 11, 13, 23, 25 and 27.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QN
July 22, 2005

Chameli C-Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/25/05